

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,474	08/09/2004	Thomas Margaria	04125	6829
23338 7590 01/02/2008 DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD			EXAMINER	
1727 KING ST SUITE 105			MAI, NGOCLAN THI	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/500,474	MARGARIA, THOMAS			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ngoclan T. Mai	1793			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 Oc</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 15-29 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 15-19 and 28 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 20-27 and 29 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	Pate			

Application/Control Number: 10/500,474 Page 2

Art Unit: 1793

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant amendment filed 10/9/07 has been entered. Claims 15-29 remain in the application examination with claim 28-29 amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/9/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the response applicant essentially argues the powder product of Meacock, II et al is not anticipated the claimed invention because the magnesium in the powder product of Meacock, II et al is not in volatile form since it has to penetrate into the bulk of the melt in order to nodularize the cast iron, the examiner submits that this is not convincing. It is because magnesium has boiling temperature lower than the temperature of the molten cast iron and when it is in contact with the molten iron it is inherently volatile. Since magnesium agent and inoculating alloy are being coated on the surface of the mold, they are submerged in molten iron when molten iron is poured into the mold and any magnesium in volatile penetrates into the bulk of the melt to nodularize the cast iron. For the above reasons claims 15, 17-19 are still deemed anticipated by the Meacock, II et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 15, 17, 18, and 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meacock, II et al. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meacock, II et al. The rejections were made in the previous office action and are incorporated herein by reference.

Application/Control Number: 10/500,474

Art Unit: 1793

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 15-19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wehmeier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2, § 152, 717).

Wehmeier et al teach inert powdered material such as powdered sand and infusorial earth, reactive metallic material such as ferrosilicon, or calcium, magnesium or aluminum alloy may be used to coat a centrifugal casting mold, col. 2, lines 1-14. Since Wehmeier et al disclose the claimed material is conventionally known in the same field of endeavor or the analogous metal casting, therefore, combining known ingredient having known functions, to provide a composition having the additive effect of each of the known functions is within realm of performance of ordinary skill artisan. In re Castner, 186 USPQ 2 13 (217). The use of conventional materials to perform their known functions in a conventional process is obvious. In re Raner, 134 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1962).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 20-27 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoclan T. Mai whose telephone number is (571) 272-1246.

 The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/500,474

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

n.m.

Mgoclan T. Mai Patent Examiner AU 1793